

With respect to Examiner's division of the invention into three groups and the reasons stated therefor, applicants respectfully travers.

The Office Action states that the inventions in group III and [I and II] are distinct, because the magnet structure in group I can be preassembled. It also states that the inventions in groups I and II are subcombinations distinct from each other, because invention I has separate utility. Applicants respectfully submit that the above observations do not appear to be of a nature that would render the inventions distinct.

Even assuming *arguendo* that Groups I, II and III represented distinct inventions, applicants submit that to search the subject matter of the two Groups together would not be a serious burden.

The M.P.E.P. § 803 (Eight Edition, August 2001) states:

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

Thus, in view of M.P.E.P. § 803, all of the original claims 1-64 should be searched and examined in the subject application.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Restriction Requirement Under 35 U.S.C. § 121 be withdrawn and the instant claims be examined in one application. It is respectfully requested that the above-made remarks be entered and made of record in the file history of the instant application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date August 26, 2002

for *Gregory V. Shecter, RN. 38,051*
for *Francis E. Morris* 24,615
Frank E. Morris (Reg. No.)

PENNIE & EDMONDS LLP
1155 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2711
(212) 790-9090